

Q.P.
Nº. 101

A
Gentle Reflection
ON THE
MODEST ACCOUNT,
AND A
VINDICATION
OF THE
Loyal Abhorrrers,
FROM THE
CALUMNIES
OF A
FACTIOUS PEN.

By the Author of the *PARALLEL*.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Benj. Tooke* at the *Ship* in *St. Paul's Church-*
yard, and *Tho. Sawbridge* at the *Three Flower-de-Luces*
in *Little-Britain*. MDCLXXXII.

Gentle Reflection

OF THE

MORAL ACCOUNT

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

A
GENTLE REFLECTION
ON THE
Modest Account, &c.

Although *Person of Quality*, in the beginning of a Book, is grown now as common as *Finis* in the end, and an illiterate Fellow might take *both* for voluminous Authors, yet this Gentleman shall have the benefit of his *Peerage*, both because he endeavours so much to secure it in the Title-Page, and also because the following Discourse looks very much like that of a *noble Peer*. So that we won't treat him like a common prostituted Scribler, though his *Books* and *Pamphlets* are tumbl'd in the City by *day*, as much as their *Jills* and *Wenches* at *night*, but give him that Title which he pretends to so *much*, and so *little* deserves: Each scribbling Ass expects now to be answer'd with a *Sir*, as well as every Whore with a *Madam*. Wherefore—

May it please your Lordship,

IT would be an officious piece of Presumption, for my Pen to defend that worthy Person, whom *yours* acknowledges (except one) the Kingdom's best Pen-man: All the Vindication here intended, is only of the King's best Subjects, from his *worst* of Enemies, and to wipe off those scurrilous Aspersions, impossible to be cast on them in any *Modest Account*. And to begin in your civil Style: All the *Lines* in your following Discourse, have very elaborately given the lye to the *first* in the Title-page; and never did man take so much pains to confute his pretensions to *Modesty*, in such impudent and *immodest* Assertions. It might have been tolerable, my Lord, for a poor senseless Scribler, for an ignorant *Theophilus*, to title his Scrole a *Rationale*, though when sifted it won't yield a grain of Sense or Reason. But for your Lordship, a man of applauded Wit and Integrity, to juggle thus with the Nation, and decoy the credulous Buyer out of his easie Sixpence, with a *Smithfield Trick*, a *Raree Show*, and a *fine front*, when there is nothing like it to be seen in the Booth; certainly this does not agree with the *Quality* of that *person* you would be *taken* to be, or that undeserved Character you may really bear.

In the first place you take notice of other peoples *Railings*, when all the while you design to write nothing but a *Satyr*; you observe persons having been *unsuccessfully* *bir'd* to libel and abuse you: That Calumnies are fruitless and ineffectual, proceeds many times from the *Guilt*, as well as *Innocence*, of those that are aspers'd. And some peoples Crimes may be so notoriously black, not to be darken'd with any deeper dye: some are arm'd with confidence against the most pointed Satyrs, and with a conceit of their own judgment, against the strongest conviction of reason; and so neither to be reclaimed by bitter Invectives, or sober Debates. But sure your *Party* cannot with any *modesty* reflect on *Hirelings*, either for *Affidavits Drudges*, or *railing Satyrists*, who first made such large Contributions for their Salaries and Maintenance; much less your

selves, shrewdly suspected for having had the breeding of such rascally *Irish* Cattle, and the sole command and management of the *Protestant* Exchequer; and so never wanted a *Whiffler*, to throw dirt in the face of the Government, or your *Plot-Leeches*, to suck the blood of any Minister of State.

But pray tell me, my Lord, Are these Volunteers, or rather hir'd Rascals, that under an *Hereditary Monarchy*, can be got to write an *History of the Succession*, only to prove it alterable, and under a merciful Monarch can insist on the Presidents of deposing Kings? Would those Wretches that live under a gracious Prince, venture to place the *Sovereignty* in the People? Were they not pretty well paid for venturing their Necks too? Would there ever have been writ *An Appeal from the Countrey*, had it not been first mov'd and encourag'd from the City? And I much question whether ever Mr. Colledge would have had the stomach to breakfast on the Gallows, had he not din'd sometimes at the *Sun-Tavern*. And therefore (were your Suggestions as rational, as they are really groundless and unreasonable) pray consider, my Lord, when you condemn loyal and honest Hearts, for *mercenary Rogues*, what will become of those poor Wretches, that can libel their Prince for a Penny, and write Treason for Bread?

It is but a little and a poor Vindication of that noble Peer, to make his paternal Revenue so rich and great: It only aggravates his continual espousing of the Quarrels of the Faction, in which commonly few engage themselves, but men desperate either in their Lives or Fortunes; it makes him to have chosen his bad Principles out of inclination and humour, which others maintain only out of want and necessity; and any Casuist would look upon a Wretch, that's starv'd almost into a Rebel, far less a Criminal, than a wanton *Jesurun* that kicks at God Almighty and his Sovereign, only because he's grown fat.

Your Lordship talks of other People's having a sort of *Impudence beyond the Jesuits*: An Emphatical description indeed of eminent Boldness, whilst you think, with a great deal of Modesty, you may lay down these following Hyperboles: First, *That your noble Peer had a chief hand in restoring our Prince*; which Paradox, I confess, shows you a bold Champion for the Cause, but a weak Assertor of the Truth, when the Memory of Man, as well as Narrative and History, can give you the Lye.

Yet I don't question but several might have a little Finger in bringing in their Sovereign, when they found it impossible to keep him out; and triumphantly shouted their *O King, live for ever*, when they could not make him die on his Father's Block: The Fox that insults o're the Lion when entangl'd in his Snare, is alway the first too that congratulates his deliverance.

But your Lordship is not the first and sole Person eminent for such palpable Forgeries in these Matters: It has been as confidently asserted, (and that long ago in Print, by as eminent a Divine, as never boggl'd at Conscience, or scrupl'd at a Lye) That the late War and Rebellion was begun by the Episcopal Party, which he in his wonted phrase *statedly* declares to be very true. It was but lately that another, as fam'd for Law, as this for Divinity, undertakes to prove the *Presbyterian* Party the sole Restorers of his Majesty; and so between them leave nothing to the poor Prelate and Cavalier, but the guilt and shame of having been Fools, Knaves, and Traitors; of having trepann'd and murder'd their Sovereign, only to oblige them with the Villany, and like poor silly Tools, let others reap the Spoils, in the following Anarchy and Confusion: And now your Lordship here has miraculously discover'd the strange Restorer of his Majesty. I confess, the Veracity of these Gentlemen, and their wild Positions, may be unquestionable with a City-Rout, a crowd of credulous Fools, or resolute Knaves: But if ever the Countrey has an occasion for a Triumvirate to write Paradoxes, Lyes and Forgeries, it will wisely pitch upon Mr. Baxt. Mr. H-t. and this Person of Quality.

You are willing to lay a great Obligation on his Majesty from his *Act of Oblivion*, but yet ungratefully forbear to mention your Party so much as oblig'd. Then you address your self to the King's Friends, and their Friends, the *Papist* together: I thought your Lordship could not allow *Roman-Catholicks* any relation or acquaintance, with men that love the Religion of the Church of England, and King of it, as in common Charity, my Lord, some of us at least may be thought to do. But why must we and they be thought such Intimates? It no way appears upon Record, my Lord, as the Familiarity of your Party with the *Jesuits*; neither has Mr. Oates sworn, that they frequent our Churches,

as he testifies they do your *Conventicles*; therefore without being such Favourites to them, if you please, we will obey your Injunctions: and

Consider what Promises, Declarations, and Engagements the dissenting Protestants had, both of his Majesty, his Lords and Bishops, at the time of his coming over, and how they have since been used, and with what Submission and Loyalty they have carried themselves.

And now must tell your Lordship, having considered and weighed every jot and tittle of it, I can answer you to every *Punctilio*; first, that the Promises your dissenting Protestants had, have certainly been made good to them, (perhaps above their bargain and expectation) I am sure beyond their merit and desert; not only the Laws, when in full force against them, and such Offenders, have been seldom executed, but for a while wholly suspended, with a general Toleration; although that, I confess, they will by no means grant to have been done in their favour, notwithstanding it seem'd extorted by their own clamors and importunity, and was the Counsel and Advice of some that are now the greatest Patriots and Bigots of their Cause. And 'tis very notorious, that this dissenting Protestant all the time of that Indulgence, resented it as an Act of Grace and Favour, (though I confess, never the nearer won to Peace and Conformity with such a condescension, but had their tender Consciences, as much harden'd and steel'd with the Lenitives of Moderation, as ever they could have been in the hottest flames of a real Persecution.) But as soon as ever they came to be bridled again by the Law, with a seasonable restraint, the Wretches (that at best but flatter and dissemble, when they command any thing in the Government) presently arraign'd it, as a design of introducing Popery, though it truly promoted nothing more than the growth of their own Faction, and made the Beast insolent and unruly, by giving it the reins, whom the curb of a severe Discipline might have made more gentle and tame. And now I would have your Lordship tell us a way of satisfying so froward and perverse a Sect, that is clamorous till it is indulg'd, and then is discontented at its own Indulgence.

But beside all this, your Lordship very well knows, that they were not only convinc'd at in their Religious Schisms, and sanctified ways of violating the Canons of the Church, and the Laws of the Realm; but some of them were advanced to Places of Honour and Profit, and far'd once altogether as well as those that had more faithfully served the King, and dutifully conform'd to the Discipline of the Church. But granting these Promises and Declarations were not so punctually perform'd, is the Government presently to be upbraided for it? And his Majesty almost told in plain terms, that had you thought he would have fail'd you so, he should never have got in the Throne so easily; and can these grumbling and discontented Wretches be call'd the Restorers of his Majesty, that would capitulate with their Prince for his Birth-right, stand upon Terms and Articles, like Rebels in a Garrison, before they will surrender, and are now sorry they had not made him compound for his Kingdoms at a dearer rate?

Your Lordship knows all this to be as true, as the Suggestions of their *hard usage* are false and malicious; would you have the greatest Laick of your Faction, made the greatest Minister of State too? that has been done already, and your Noble Peer himself, advanc'd to the Mace; would you have some Head of your canting Priests prefer'd to be the Head of our Church, and a thing put for the Pillar of it, that has twice endeavour'd to undermine it? why somewhat of this has been offer'd too, and we have Mr. Baxter's own word for it, that he refused a Bishoprick; and now for God's sake, my Lord, what usage would you your self advise to be shown to such Miscreants, whom neither Honour or Profit, can persuade so much, as to suffer the Government to remain undisturb'd?

Thus much for our Promises and Usages; now, my Lord, for their Loyalty and Submission, which you so vainly extol and magnifie; but I wish your Eloquence a more copious Theam, when-ever you have a mind to write a Panegyrick, or else you'll want indeed a great deal of Invention, or rather another part of Rhetorick, plain Hyperbole, to make amends for the barrenness of the Subject: You talk of the difficulty of finding a parallel Instance, but all the while don't instance in one single act of this unparalleled Submission; and you vindicate your own Party, just at the same rate as you vilify all others, only with general Assertions; but your Lordship shall see, I will more

fairly demonstrate their *Treasons* and *Insurrections*, than you have done their *Loyalty* and *Submission*.

His Majesty was hardly settled in his Throne, before these *submissive* Villains began to disturb it; in — 61. *Venner* and his Crew were plotting on the Government, discovered and executed for High-Treason; about — 62. *Phillips, Tongue, Gibbs*, and one *Stubbs*, with another, were arraigned for a Plot, as Hellish altogether as this of the Papists, the latter of which confesses the Fact before his Tryal, the other four abiding it, were upon full evidence condemned and executed. In — 63. we have one Captain *Oates*, mustering up his Regiment of Traytors. In — 66. Another little Mutiny and Rebellion of a parcel of discontented Officers and Souldiers, lately Mr. *Colledge*, that with his last breath profess'd himself a *dissenting Protestant*, condemned and executed for a more, *unparallel'd* piece of *Treason*, than any *incomparable* Instance you can give of Dissenters *Loyalty*; and last of all, for a head to this Comet, this long train of Rebellion, out comes the treasonable Scheme of *Association*; and alarms the Kingdom with the fearful Prefages of a second War.

Thus much, my Lord, for the *submission* of *English* Dissenters since the Restoration; and now for the *Loyal* deportment of your *Scottish* one; How many Field-Preachers since — 60. have been executed, renouncing with their last breath, all Allegiance and Supremacy? *Kid* and *King*, two late Villains, that preach'd Rebellion at the very place of Execution, no doubt 'twas with a great deal of *Submission*; they made two several Insurrections, one of which was but lately dispers'd at *Bothwell-Bridge*; they *submissively* murdered the Bishop of *St. Andrews*, and very lately with a great deal of *Dissenters Humanity*, mangled and mutilated the poor Souldiers; These are many, I hope, and strong Evidences of their *bad* Carriage, whereas you have not given one single Instance of their *good*.

Your business in the next Paragraph, is to make the discover'd *Association* a Popish Hobgoblin too, a Mormo conjur'd up at *White-Hall*; or to use your own expression, *The keeping Hounds in full cry with a Red-Herring, out of their own Kitchen, trail'd through the Kingdom to make a noise*.

A pleasant Metaphor, I confess; in comparing a piece of Rebellion with a *Red-Herring*; somewhat a more apposite Allegory, even upon this account, because both are great Commodities in the Dutch Common-wealths; but I fancy, my Lord, could your Party but have kept this *Herring* close, and drying in their own *Chimney*, till the Nations Palate had been a little better disposed to relish such a salt Bit, the *Dogs* that would have follow'd the scent then, I am afraid would have shown themselves a thirsty sort of *Blood-Hounds*, and took some of the King's best Subjects for their Prey; but now this *dried Fish* has took a little Air, and rank *Treason* stunk and offended the whole Kingdom, 'tis no wonder if your Party won't allow the *Dish* to come out of their *Kitchen*, when it looks as if it had been *drest* in *Hell*, and had the *Devil* for its Cook.

Your Lordship has not *carefully* perused those Proceedings at the *Old-Baily*; neither is to be imagined how you should impartially, when you seem to be so much *prejudiced*, or else you would find the *Impudence* to lye on your side, in making the seizing of the *Paper* questionable; the words of Mr. *Gwin* are as positive as the Case could admit, which are plainly these: *It was certainly there, for there I found it; I don't know as to the particular Paper, but all in that Bag were there: vid. page 34.*

Now your Lordship won't allow it to be positive Evidence, because not to the particular Paper. But suppose, my Lord, one of your *Irish* Witnesses should transport hither a Ship-load of his Country Cattel, to stock your Lordships Mannor, would you not believe him, if he swore they all came from thence, and it was unlikely any other Breed should leap up in the Voyage?

And sure that *Gentleman* may pass for a more competent Witness than a common *Bog-trotter*. The Messengers seiz'd a whole bundle of *Colledge's* infamous, treasonable *Ballads*; had it not been positive Evidence, if they had sworn only to the whole Bundle, as well as if to the particular *Ballad*, produc'd in the Court? But you can't have the Patience or Heart to examine the Parallel, it being the woful Case of a *dissenting Protestant*. But then you will take the pains to consider this; there were Bundles of Letters found in *Coleman's* Study, two or three of which were only used in his Tryal; would

would your Lordship have had that sort of Traytor escap'd too, had the Witnesses been only able to swear to the Papers in general that they found, and not to the very particular one produc'd?

I don't know in what *English* Reports your Lordship has met with Monsieur Fouquet's Case, which is a *French* one; I am sure your Honour would be loth to be tryed by their Arbitrary Laws, when it can hardly abide the Test of ours. And whatever you think, I fancy the State is *higher concern'd* against him that endeavours to *subvert* it, than him that only *defrauds* its Exchequer; And yet the one you see has been kept a long time Prisoner in the *Bastile*, though the other quickly got out of the *Tower*. And as for those Laws of *Nature* and *Reason*, you urge on your part, sure they are never so irrational, to befriended a man suspected for unnatural plotting against his Prince, and the Father of his Country, which was the thing then in question; but its being a loose Paper and unsubscribed, will that exempt a man from being questioned, especially in Matters of Treason, where there are no Accessories, but every Concocter a Principal? Were not some of the Jesuits questioned for Papers unsubscribed, and *Langborn* partly condemn'd for receiving Commissions never produc'd, found, or like to be heard of? And these *Parallel Instances*, I don't urge as an extenuation of their Guilt, who merited death by the Law, but to shew your foul Reasoning and prejudic'd Argumentation, in making that sort of Evidence *lights* and *empty* in your *Friends* Case, though only to put him upon his Tryal, when you thought it *full* and *weighty* in your *Enemies*, even for their Sentence and Execution.

The detestation of a damnable piece of Treason, your Lordship calls, *A Popish Clamor and Abhorrence*. Are they all Papists, my Lord, that protest to defend his Majesty? If so, your own Party will be libel'd too in that Accusation, who most of all make such Protestations, though they least intend it.

And if they must be *Papists*, that *vow* to preserve the present Government of Church and State, your Lordship, by such Doctrines, will draw more Proselytes to the *Romish* Faith, than ever did *Priest* or *Jesuit*, (or to use your own words) have given a greater Blow to the Protestant Religion, than all that ever went before you; for such wild Positions, and unreasonable Censures, will make all to be of that Communion, who love their God and their King, or are willing to commence good *Christians* and loyal *Subjects*. But notwithstanding all your malicious Accusations, is it to be prov'd there were any *Roman-Catholicks*, that promoted these late *Abhorrences*, or any single one that sign'd such an *Address*, though they were ready perhaps to do it, and can shame some of our Protestants, whose Religion truly gives no such Dispensations for Treason and Rebellion, and consequently should make them better Subjects? Yet some of *those* spent their Blood for our late Sovereign, when so many of ours lost it in fighting against him; and also 'tis unadvisedly objected, that the *Papists* should be concern'd in these *Abhorrences*, for that would make them more Friends to your Party than any other, in affording you Matter for aspersing all those, as such with whom they subscribe; and only give your Lordship and your Crew a Pretence for such scandalous Suggestions. But the mischief of it is, they do no great service in such a forbearance, since we deal with an Accuser, as subtil and malicious as that primitive one the *Devil*, and who would blast his Enemies Reputation, were they all *Angels*.

But, my Lord, there are a number of as great and better Subjects than your selves, who have better thoughts too, concerning the late *Abhorrences*, and are so far from being troubl'd at what they have done, or perswaded to forbear, by your unjust censuring and traducing it, that they many times in their *Addresses* beg pardon for not having begun sooner; not my Lord, but that it was *abhor'd* in the Heart of every good Subject, look'd on as the Contrivance of Hell and *Darkness*, as soon as ever it came to light, but that they vye with one another for an *early* of those villanous designs, which they think none can *soon* enough detest. Upon the appearance of your terrible *Comes*, the Nation seem'd to gaze a while on the dreadful *Phenomenon*, before they could make their *Observations*; and the Reason why they might not presently fall on *abhorring* such damnable Practices, might proceed rather from the *deep* Impression it had on their Minds, than any *shallow* Inadvertency; for Hearts that are surprized with any Passion, either of Love or Detestation, have their Tongues for a while suspended from expressing their Sentiments and inward Conceptions. It has always been the stale Clamour of
the

the vigilant and jealous Faction, that the King and Kingdom was asleep; if so, I am confident they have now pretty well awakes'd both out of their secure slumber. And that with a ghastly *Spectrum* of a Rebellion, and the dreadful Ghost and Appearance of another Civil War.

In the next place, Your Lordship lays a mighty stress on the single Vote of an House of Commons; and well you may, my Lord, when your Friends have had of late such an influence and Interest therein, and any States-man will have a great Conceit of their Proceedings, who think well of his Maxims, and take him for their *Achitophel*. But this is but a reciprocal sort of associating in one anothers Defence, and somewhat like that natural Combination there is among some Creatures, when they are muzzling of a Thistle, to claw one another. Yet, my Lord, should the next House be men of other Sentiments, condemn the Treason of this Association, vote him for an Enemy to King and Country, in whose Custody it was found, would your Lordship be willing, their Order'd and Resolv'd should be the sole Test of the Guilt, as well as Innocence of the Person? Yet our own Chronicles will afford Instances of greater Alterations in the Vein and Humour of Parliaments, and whose Pulses have beaten as strongly quite another way: A Parliament deposed *Richard* the second, and a Parliament advanc'd *Edward* the fourth; a Parliament set a price on the Head of our present King, and a Parliament afterward set the Crown upon it. And why one House of Commons may not as well vote him a Friend to the King and Kingdom, whom others have done an Enemy, I cannot understand?

But then from *Irish-Witnesses* and well-chosen Juries, the whole Nation prays as well as your Lordship, *Good Lord deliver us*; but then you may give them leave to curse too, those that first brought over the one, and pack't the other. It seems *Haynies* was no Irishman, when a blank Pardon was su'd for; *Dennis, Oenal*, and *Macnamarra*, no Rogues, so long as they would hang none but Papists: *Willmoors, Rowser, Whitakers, Harveys*, and the Jury (I should have nam'd first) of the noble Peer you vindicated; these were not pick'd and chosen, were they? But because you instance in unreasonable Damages given by the *Surrey-men*, you shall have a *Rowland* for that *Oliver* too; and what do you think of that of the *Guild-hall*, who found it Assault and Battery, for an Officer to pull off an insolent Fellow's Hat, when upon his Tryal in an Ecclesiastical Court, (a Fellow that behav'd himself as rudely towards your Party, in his *Curse ye Merox*, as he has done since to ours in his *Naked Truth*?) And what a dishonest and ungrateful sort of Retribution is it, for them to countenance now such a turbulent Wretch, only because he can disturb our establish'd Church, when all our sober persons condemn'd him for such an impetuous Railing, even against your unwarranted Assemblies? What can an indifferent, and impartial person, think of the foulness of such Proceedings, but that you would close with any Villain, that will but libel the Government, and even with your worst of Enemies, to do it an injury, observing a sort of malicious Politicks, in the very directing of your Anger and Revenge, and wisely smother your Resentments against a private Foe, if you can but make him an Instrument to disturb the publick Peace?

But, my Lord, the truth of it is, that which makes you so uneasy, is, you find your selves lath'd with Rods of your own making, and have conjur'd up a sort of Devils, that won't be aw'd only by your own Wand, and whom, all your Sorceries, I am afraid, won't quickly lay. *Cavies* in the late time was an opprobrious Name fix'd on good Subjects, and then they were nett'd as soon as *Roundhead* was given to the bad; *Whig* now had never been thought of, had not *Tory* been first started; we should have had no *Pilkington* Juries, had the *E. of S.* been put upon his Tryal; and you would have met, my Lord, with no such Gentle Reflection, had you not first publish'd your *Modest Account*; and since your Party alway leads the Dance, can you in Conscience blame any for following the Round?

Then as for the business of the *City-Charter*, perhaps it may not be so long in being compass'd, as your Lordship imagines; and for the justice you shall meet for your Fortunes when 'tis gone, I dare promise, will be better than others will meet with for their *Lines* while 'tis there. But why do you think it so long, my Lord? Are Charters given and confirm'd without any Limitations and Reserves? Had they their Swords in their hands when 'twas granted? And did they article and capitulate for theirs in the City,

as the Barons did for the great one in the Meadow? Then perhaps your Advocates might find a Clause in it, to prove it not forfeited by *Rebellion*; in which the City seems already so deeply engag'd, as if it were actually in another state of *War* with its Sovereign: For won't your Lordship judge that *Ass* to rebel against his *Driver*, in standing still, or running back, as well as if he had lifted up his heel against his Master? And how near the stopping the Channel of the Laws, or perverting the Justice of the Nation, borders on the taking up of Arms, and the cutting out their own Statutes with the Sword, I leave even to the Determination of your Lordship, who perhaps were an Eye-witness of that fatal Affinity that is between them, and what a pretty sort of *Prælude* it prov'd to the Civil War.

The *President* of the *Guises* was the most unhappiest Parallel your Lordship could have brought upon the Stage, and at this time had been much better omitted, it suiting as little with your Lordships Application, as it mightily agrees with your Parties Practices. The *Guises* were a bloody *Faction* indeed, and design'd the overthrow of that Monarchy, by the same means and measures your *Associators* do that of ours. It was they deluded a youthful Prince with the hopes of a Crown, and strengibn'd their Party by the weakness of a young Duke: It was they made the profess'd Religion a pretence for all the Defolations that attended a miserable War: It was they drew up the primitive *Association*, and were the first Founders of an *Holy League*: Lastly, 'twas they fell a cutting the Throats of the poor *Hugonots*, and distinguish'd themselves in the bloody night at *Paris*, with a white Scarf on their Elbows: And by your endeavouring to remove *Guards*, one would think you design'd the same way to cut off Popish Abhorrrers, and make your green and blew Streamers serve for the same purpose they us'd their white. And so we may ee'n conclude this Paragraph with an hearty Prayer, as well as your Lordship does his with a faint Wish; That God would preserve the King, and keep us out of the hands of all bloody *Papists*, and as cruel and inhumane a sort of *Protestants*.

Your Lordship has not only the *Subtily* of the *Serpent*, but the *Venom* too, and that you spit forth all now here in this place, in arraigning the best Actions of the Duke, for the worst Plot and Conspiracy, and making his passing the Test in *Scotland*, a fair step to the destruction of the *Protestant* Religion. Is the swearing to preserve the present establish'd Religion, the way to subvert it? Are not the *Bishops* there as competent Judges of what will undermine the Church, as your Lordship, who profess your self a Friend to *Protestant* Dissenters, and such as would blow her up? And han't they thank'd his Majesty for his sending his Royal Brother, and testified their satisfaction of his Zeal for our Church? But these, you will say, are all bless'd with a *Torish* Humility, (as your new phrase has it) though upon other occasions, you can dignifie them with their old Appellation of *proud Prelates*. But, my Lord, do you think that the Field-Preachers there, (to whom you must be a Friend, if to the dissenting Ministers here) do you think, I say, they show what is more expedient for the good of the Church, in refusing the Test, than those spiritual Lords did in passing it? Do you think that the *Rebels* at *Boswell-bridge*, did not make a fairer step to the destruction of the *Protestant* Religion, than, as you maliciously suggest, his Royal Highness and the *Parliament* have done since? But we must give people leave, when they are nett'd with Passion and Revenge, to be transported into *Lyes* and *Absurdities*; and Malice is alway the greatest Enemy to *Truth* and *Reason*.

Your next Paragraph falls foul again upon *Abhorrrers*, whom you look upon as a pitiful *Faction*, when all honest people take them for true *Loyalists*. But waving the absurdity in calling them *factious*, which none can reasonably apply, but to such as oppose the Government in Church and State, their Numbers are not so small as to be pitiful or contemptible; two or three thousand Free-holders are said to subscribe that of *Derby*, and then more, I am sure, by much, than could be gotten out of any County in *England* to your *Petitions*. And could your Lordship but get the favour and opportunity to consult the List, you would find them more numerous, and much to your dissatisfaction; and also amongst them, many persons that have serv'd their Country in *Parliament*, and been Members of that Honourable Assembly, to whom you pay so great a Deference. But it is a little harsh Censure for you to suspect all the *Country-Sheriffs* for *ill men*, and their *under-Sheriffs* for *Rogues*. Could we but get an indifferent person to decide the Controversie, he would with more reason judge your *City-Officers* for such, Gentlemen

commonly vers'd in the juggling Tricks of Buying and Selling, and all the methods of a privileged Knavery, such as first set about *packing* of *Juries*, and alarming the Nation with an *obstruction* of *Justice*. And won't you allow the King and his Council to be as honest and wise, and as fit to prick the *one*, as your *City-Rout* and Rabble, who choose the *other*?

I can't imagine what you mean by this elaborate task, and all this fruitless pains you take to prove the number of *Abhorers* so small and insignificant, unless your meaning be only this, to show plainly that you contend for a Party, and have sent abroad your *Musters*, *masters*, to take a List of all your *Voluntiers*, or else have got your *Association* to stalk about the Kingdom *incognito*, and now upon comparing the *Subscribers* of that with those of our *Abhorers*, find your selves the stronger by a million, or *thereabouts*; but I fancy, were this really so, you would never suffer this *Abhorring* and *Protesting* to go on so quietly. Yet, my Lord, I'll debate, though not the *truth*, yet the *Reason* of this Matter still more fairly with your Lordship: Give you all that the prejudic'd Party can desire, and for a while suppose this Paper of *Association* a meet Sham, and a piece of Forgery, or in your own phrase, *A red Herring*, trail'd through the Kingdom to make a noise, yet still why must all those that detest and *abhor* it be traduc'd as *Popish*, only because they dislike a Paper that is in it self *treasonable*, and which your own selves presume *unwarrantable* at least, by your seeming to renounce it? There is every year a Zeal, as hot, as the Flames themselves, shown against his *Holiness* in *Pasteboard*, and in God's Name let them still in that Matter express their Resentment: But you would think it a hard Censure, my Lord, to traduce all that innocent Rabble in *Fleetstreet*, for Puritans and Fanatics, only because they express such an Abhorrence to that painted Effigie, when all this while this is but a Pope of their own making. And why then must all those be vilified as *Tories*, *Hounds*, and *Popish Abhorers*, that only dislike, declare, burn, and protest against a *paper'd Idol* of a Common-wealth, in whose Forehead is writ *Treason*, as well as *Abomination* in the others.

Now when I have been so fair as to yield to your Lordship in his own *Postulatum*, and yet the Corollary deduc'd will detract much from that Reasoning and *Modesty* you pretend to, what will become of those Pretensions, when it appears a demonstrable Proposition, that this *Scream of Rebellion* was drawn by your own Party, and truly found where it was sworn to be? And therefore for those Considerations tender'd to us in the beginning of your Book, let us offer these to you toward the end of ours. Consider this Engine, and design how much it looks like the Workmanship of your State-Projectors: And though the end seem'd somewhat honest, pretending to unite a divided Nation, consider it will never be compass'd in animating a factious and a zealous Crew; 'tis a Work only now for Omnipotence it self to heal our Breaches, and cure our Divisions; and the Union of God's people will never be perfected by your *Protestant Joiners*, and such Agents of the Devil. Consider how likely that Faction is to contrive such an *Association*, which has been so well vers'd in drawing up so many *Covenants*, and how improbable it is, that those who enter'd into a *League* to fight against *Charles the First*, should *associate* themselves for the preservation of the *Second*. But these are but such Arguments, I confess, as the Schools call, *à probabilibus*; that which makes it demonstrably plain, are the Shifts your Party use to avoid the Imputation, whose Answers, when they are question'd about it, are like those of conscious Criminals, full of Distraction. Sometimes they fancy the truth of its being found not plain enough, and then they deny the Matter of Fact; then they begin to distrust that Refuge, and stand up for its defence, backing it with a President in *Queen Elizabeth's* time; and pray, my Lord, *Would you not take the young Bear to be the Whelp of such a Dam, if you found her licking the little uniform'd Monster into shape?* Then for its being found in the Closet, we have a plain positive Oath, and that of a very credible Witness: The Keys sworn to be deliver'd by your Earl's own hand; his Servants by whom the Papers were put up, and the Bag seal'd: And sure his vigilant Domesticks would never suffer their Master to be so grossly abus'd, had they put up other Papers than were found, and brought *Treason* in their Pockets when they came to search for it. My Lord, It was the same poor defence *Colledge* made, to the finding his *treasonable Ballads*, and when nothing else could confront the Evidence, it was insinuated as if they were laid there by the Searchers: And you would do well to use some better Arguments for so great a person whom you would prove inno-

rent, than they did for a rascally Joyner, whom all impartial people thought guilty. But nothing makes it more unquestionable than those poor Shifts you use in *questioning* it: You say, *Gwin dares not swear it*; and any one (by what you say there to the contrary) would swear you don't deny it; and all your Argumentations look so conscious and guilty, that they *betray* the very Cause they pretend to defend. Among Heads that have but one grain of *stuffed* Logick, or *natural* Reason, 'tis alway presum'd, that nothing can be like it self; and what ever has any Reference, must have another Extream to which it may refer; and then what need of all this Comparison and Similitude, if there be nothing square, with which you would compare it? What heed has your Lordship to talk of Queen Elizabeth's Association as a Parallel, if nothing since has been contriv'd like it, by your Friends and Associates? But you will say, There has been a pretended one put upon you: Then my Lord, let me ask you, Would you take all this pain to justify a piece of Treason forg'd by your Enemies? Did any of your Party write in favour of the Papers found in the *Meal-Tub*? If these are your Measures and best Politicks, what better Encouragement can there be for Shams and Forgeries, than by writing Panegyricks and favourable Parallels, on those Treasons of which you are suspected and accus'd.

You very civilly will allow his Majesty a Prerogative to call a Parliament; but like the curs'd Cow that gives a little good Milk, which she presently kicks down with her heels; or Mr. H-t, that defends the Bishops in his Book, and blows them up in the Post-script, your next Lines talk of having them conven'd frequently, and sit *usefully*, that is indeed, whensoever your selves please, and as long as your Faction shall think fit, or till Grievances are redress'd, and the Bill of Exclusion pass'd. But for these Masters, I may, with better Authority, use your own words in the business of the Charter, *Assure your Lordship, It will be long before it be done.*

But I would fain have you fix, my Lord, that indefinite Term of *Frequent Parliaments*.

Is your Lordship for *Triennial* ones again? The Consequences of that were too fatal, to expect such another unreasonable Grant: And besides, it is not above a twelvemonth since that your Lordship had one, and that to your Mind too, and therefore as yet no Reason to complain. But if *great Emergencies* (as you say) shall determine the Prince to convene his States, sure you may give him and his Council leave to judge whether they are really so or not: Otherwise Dr. Oates's Quarrel with the *Seach Knights*, or the Disappointment of the *City-Feast*, may by some be thought Matter of *great Emergency*, and worthy the Consideration of a Parliament; neither will the People, my Lord, as Things stand now, be all of your Sentiments, in thinking his Majesty's Friends and Counsellors, *humble Tories*, *stupid Fools*, or *deserving Villains*; the best opinion you can have of them, for not advising his Majesty (as you think fit) to call a *Parliament*. We know those that gave *worse* Advice both for the Kingdom and all Christendom beside; those that in their *best* regretted the Success of their own Councils, and maliciously took now and then a few good Measures, lest others should do it for them. I can't apprehend, my Lord, what that distance of Time is, in which, without a *Parliament*, our Liberties would expire, and our selves, on a sudden, be shackl'd into Slaves. We han't seen one for a whole year, and perhaps may not for another; and yet after many expir'd, I dare swear, our *Magna Charta* will be still the same, though your *City-Charter* may not. We will allow you *Parliaments* to be the Subjects *Birth-right*, but then, I hope, we are not born to all sorts of *Parliaments*; that Position, my Lord, would make you put in for a *Right* to that in Forty one, since by special Act declar'd Traitors.

Your Lordship proposes by way of smart Interrogatory: *Whether the King's Prerogative in appointing the day, will deprive us of the Right of having them in such a time, and his Power of dissolving can render them useless to us?*

I confess, to men of your own Principles and Sentiments, 'tis impossible to answer them; for such are resolv'd to take it for granted, that the not letting them sit when they please, is a *deprivation* of the Right of the Subject; and the dissolving them when the King pleases, is that which makes them *useless*, whereas there are as great Men, and as good Head-pieces, who think the quite contrary. And that his Majesty's appointing the day, is the only Security we can have for their Sitting: Perhaps without it we might have a Convocation of Rebels; but not a Parliament; a major part of Members

treason-

treasonably associated, but never an *House of Commons* lawfully assembled: And then in this Case also differing so far from your Opinion, that they think the only thing that can make them *useful*, is the King's Power to dissolve them. I confess, to men that make an *House of Commons* to patronize all their Irregularities, to countenance all those gross Abuses they put upon the Government; to such a Dissolution is a *useless* thing indeed, and deprives them of the making an *honourable Assembly*, a pretended Abettor of all their *scandalous Actions*. And now for your two *civil Interrogatories*, give me leave to propose a couple of *honest Queries*.

1. Whether the late King's frequent *Parliaments*, did not bring the Nation into that miserable Confusion?

2. Whether his not being able to *dissolve* them, did not bring him to the Block?

I fancy, your Lordship has the same Notions of *Parliaments*, that a late wild extravagant Author has publish'd in his *Tory-Plot*, That they have an *absolute Dominion over the Lives, Liberties, and Estates*, of all the Subjects; *vid.* page 16. But with what Face then can such Wretches talk of his Majesty's assuming an Arbitrary Power, when all the while they endeavour to make their petty Kings in *Representative* more absolute than the *Turk* himself? And can't the miserable Change that they made at *Athens*, terrifie these preposterous Assertors of Liberty, and satishe them of the *Felicity* of the Subject, even under a *tyrannizing Prince*, in respect of the *Miseries* they suffer'd under a *Common-wealth of Tyrants*? This, I confess, is a Power of *Parliaments*, that would give them an unquestionable Right for the altering Succession, when it impowers them to deprive the right Heir of his Life too, as well as of his Dominion. But I would have such an extravagant Fellow tell me, What sort of Government he stands up for? and what Notion the silly Wretch has of Justice and Equity? Does not this giddy *Libertine* at the same time draw up a Scheam for *Tyranny* and *Oppression*, when he would be thought to stand up for the *Liberties* and *Freedom* of the Subject, and like a crack'd-brain'd Politician, run counter to his own *Maxims*? This Gentleman first preaches up his absolute Dominion in *King, Lords, and Commons*, and then what Security have we, that his gifted Brethren won't come and found it again in Grace, and so place it only in their sanctified Brothers of the Lower House? And then no wonder if *Clubs* turns up *Trump* again, when they are let alone to *shuffle the Cards*. We'll grant this politick Ass his *Parliament* so far omnipotent, as able to make any *Statute*, but then they must be consonant to the *Laws* of Nature and Reason: Our Saviour among all his Precepts never contradicted those, and sure his Commission was a little larger than that of the *Parliament's* they adore. Must their Laws determine what is just and equitable? or rather ought not Justice and Equity be the Standard of their Laws? There is a great deal of difference sure between *Legality* and *Justice*, the Power of making Laws, and the *Reason* of them: But it is always observable, that every politick Body, when it endeavours to swell it self into an arbitrary Sway, will be sure to confound them. Thus those Villains, conceited of their own treasonable Principles, justified the Murder of our late Sovereign, only because they pass'd an *Act* for his Tryal, and made their own Orders a punishing of him according to *Law*. Thus *Strafford* might be said to be *legally* executed, because they then made accumulated Treason, death by a *Law*; and now another would *illegally* die for the same Crimes, because they pass'd *another* to make his Case no President. But would a *Turk* or *Mahometan* take this for Justice? And with the same false Notions, our present States-men justify the *Lawfulness* of the Bill of Exclusion, only because when their Parliament has enacted it, it will be really *Law*. But would an Hea-then take this for a piece of Equity? And these same Bigots, for a Parliamentary Power, upon these Principles, are forc'd to grant them a Right of punishing Offenders, by *Statutes* enacted after their Offence, and to make them suffer by those Laws they could never transgress, when even the Judge of all the Earth has made it *no Transgression*, where there is *no Law*.

It is a pretty sort of State-Paradox, my Lord, to say a Parliament *can do no wrong*: The only Argument they use for such a strange Position is, that there is somewhat of improbability, so great and wise a Body should enact any thing contrary to Reason or Equity. But, my Lord, since we know these great Bodies to be but *humane*, why may they not sometimes verifie the Latin Aphorism, and *err* too? Or why should not a numerous Assembly be as *fallible* as his single Holiness? Since we have known several poor Subjects

Subjects ruin'd with an Act of Parliament, why should we alway think it to do right? and since we have seen such a mighty Senate transported, like *one man*, with *Fears, Jealousies, Animosities, and Discontent*, and that to the very ruin of three Kingdoms, why should we think the Nation secur'd, of being sav'd by their *deliberate Councils*, and *sober Debates*? And these Reasons I offer, with a greater veneration for that Body, than those fawning Sycophants, that would be thought to revere it more, and who with a sort of *blind Obedience*, think them *infallible* too, and stretch'd the Power of their Governours, even to the unhinging of the Government it self.

In the next place, my Lord, you fancy the *Militia*, as you call them, of *Abhorrrers*, and *Addressors*, will put a trick upon you, one of these days, and tell you, that by *Religion*, establish'd by *Law*, they meant *Papery*, as establish'd by *Magna Charta*; a pretty conceit indeed: But why may not we fancy too, when you set up so plausibly for the *Government*, that you mean nothing else, but that of *Oliver Cromwel*, and that your bawlings which are always the loudest, about Religion, is only for the Catechisms of your *old Assemblies*, and the re-establishing of a *Directory*? I can assure your Lordship, your Friends, the Protestant Dissenters, have put this trick upon us once already, and so we have more reason to fear such another Cheat, than you that were never serv'd so, and are too cunning to be circumvented. But why does this *Militia of Abhorrrers* shiver you now into such a panick fear, when but in the preceding Page, you swagger at them as a parcel of inconsiderate Fellows, twelve or a Bakers dozen in a County; I am afraid, you fancy too, with your Friend, in his *Tory Plot*, that these *Addressors* only make his Majesty *fearful of Parliaments*, and so you will be never like to have one; whereas, any rational body, would rather think the quite contrary. And that these Assurances of their Fidelity, and Resolutions to protect him against all his Enemies, upon any colour or pretence whatsoever, should make the King venture the calling of a Parliament, though your City had the choosing of every Member, and they were sure to prove another such a pack of Traytors as those in Forty one. But did ever a forging Villain cast a more unreasonable aspersions, on so many loyal Hearts, that love their Country as well as their King, that they but endeavour to make him *fearful of Parliaments*, when your own Party still talks, how *fearfully* they were dissolv'd at Oxford, which was long before any Declaration was penn'd, or *Addresser* thought of? and if your Protestant Friends show themselves Turbulent, Factious, and Dangerous, pray tell us who they are, that make the Nation *timorous and fearful*? and therefore, my Lord, you might have forborn to have term'd them in such terrible Jargon, a *Militia*, we having nothing that can be call'd so, but the *Train'd-Bands*, and his Majesties standing Forces, unless you have procur'd an Army, to obey that *major part of disbanded Members*.

The growth of the *French King* ought least of all to be imputed to us, since your own Faction is alway the Promoter of *foreign Invasions*, as well as of *domestick Broils*; and nothing makes a *Neighbouring Prince* look *higher*, than the Civil Dissentions amongst his *Neighbours*, which will be sure to keep them *low*; the Wars here at home, on our Continent, made *William of Normandy*, take that opportunity of invading it, who had bought his Conquest at a dearer Rate, if *Harold* had not sold a great deal of *English Blood* before; the Footing we once had in *France*, might have been still retain'd, had not the jealousies of a Faction at home, given occasion for their revolting abroad; while Malcontent's here, were always quarrelling at the Government of the Regent there; and our Kings necessitated to leave Forces, to keep their *Subjects* orderly in *England*, when they might have subdued their *Enemies* in *France*. And to what sort of People, now do the *French* owe their growth? But, your Lordship, has less reason again to take up such a defensive Weapon, in the Vindication of your noble Peer, when it wounds the Party that wheels it in the Rebound, more than ever it does the Adversary in the direct Strok. All the Kingdom knows, who they were, that perswaded the breaking of the *Triple League*, and then the whole World may judge, who *nurst up the King of France to this height*; had that *Old one* been yet inviolated, there wou'd have been no need of this *New one of Gueranty*. The *French Conquests* had never made up so large a Map, or the *Spaniards* retain'd so little Footing in the *Netherlands*; so that upon Computation, my Lord, to all that poor *Bankrupt Country*, your own Friends will be the *Creditors*, and all Christendom in your debt, for a vast expence of Blood as well as Moneys; and well may your Lordship's Party be con-

tented to see a *most Christian King* lord it over all *Europe*, when they envied even his Majesties success against the *Moors* in *Africa*; and those that were so little mov'd at the Siege of *Tangier*, can never be much troubled at the Conquest of *Flanders*.

In the next Page, you very fairly confess your self a friend to *Protestant Dissenters*; the Confession is somewhat generous and superfluous too, because we should have understood that without it; but the Reasons you give for it, are most absurdly vain and ridiculous. First, you say, because there is not yet found an *Infallible* decider of Faith; the same Logick will afford you an Argument for the befriending *Turks* and *Mahometans*, who have a sort of Faith too, and believe better in their *Alcoran*, than men of your Principles can do in the *Creed*. Secondly, because they live *soberly* and *honestly* by you; but did they do so, when they plundered, sequestered, and massacred their fellow-Subjects; when they deposed, fought, and murder'd their Sovereign? I can assure your Lordship, they were as true *Protestant Dissenters* as any of your *Friends*, and do they live *soberly* and *honestly* now, when they violate the Laws most *immoderately*, abuse the Government *grossly*, and combine together *treasonably*?

I will concur with your Lordship, in an *Abhorrence* (if you can bear with that expression) of *Popery*, grant that it is a *Religion*, inconsistent with Government, and full of *rebellious* Principles; But suppose, my Lord, that the *Alcoran* did authorise the deposing and murdering of Princes: For as their History tells us, there are *Fanatical* Sects among those *Heathens* too. Would your Lordship, for that, ever have the better opinion of the *Popes* Bull, that first pulls off their *Purple Robes*, and then delivers them to be crucified? Or did the *Turks* *Mufti* preach up *Rebellion*, would you think *Priests* and *Jesuits* good Subjects? The *blackness* of one *Negro*, will never make another of the same colour appear *white*. And yet, my Lord, this is the very Case; the *Popish Councils* have allow'd the deposing of Kings, and how can you defend our *Assemblies*, that have commenc'd the same sort of *Casuits*? *Pope Hildebrand* countenanc'd that Arch-Rebel *Phocas*, against his Sovereign, yet you are a Friend to *Mr. Baxter*, that maintain'd the *Usurpation* of *Oliver Cromwel*; their *Suarez* and *Bellarmines*, no doubt, are damn'd by you, for treasonable *Doctrines*, and yet you can own your self a favourer of *Knox*, and *Buchanan*; 'tis plain, my Lord, that *both* these Religions are rebellious, and these treasonable Positions have been on *both* sides defended, and some of the very *Reformers* of our Religion, have been so little Friends to *Monarchy*, and so much agreed with the *Romanists* they dissented from, as to tolerate, in some Cases, the dangerous Doctrine of deposing Kings; and there is still but a small interval, between a degraded Prince, and a *Prisoner*; and then it was the Assertion of our Royal Martyr, that died for it, and verified the fatal Aphorism in his blood, that there is but a little distance between their *Prisons*, and the *Grave*.

Your Lordship reflects on the *black* Transactions of *Court-Converts*; but I can tell you of the *blacker* Crimes of those that have *deserted* it, and become your own *Proselytes*, such as have been drawn from their Love and Allegiance to their Sovereign, with the *Sorceries*, *Cunning*, and *Carresses* of your *High and Mighties*, that can keep open *Entertainments* for every staggering *Judas*, and make the Devil, and *Sedition*, enter the compleated *Apostate* with a *Sop*; these are those, that are now adays betraying their Sovereign too, with a sort of *Kiss*, and with a pretence of discovering his *Enemies* about him, would dispossess him of his real Friends, and persuade the Nation, they know every *evil Minister of State*, from their having been a little concern'd in the Affairs of it: But what does your Lordship think of the Faith and Integrity of these *Runagadoes*, that were formerly nothing but Objects of your Hatred and Indignation, *Enemies to King and Country*? And what security have you, they will serve you more faithfully than they did their Prince; those *pamper'd Jesurans*, that fatten'd with his Bounty, kick at him, only for withdrawing his hand, and like a politick sort of *Table-Brutes*, fawn no longer than they are fed.

But, can any soul living, take the suggestions, and insinuations of these discontented Wretches for *Gospel-Truths*, and their discoveries of the slips and failings in the Government, (which none ever was without) for *Revelation*, when these lying Oracles of the Rabble, are possess'd with a Devil of malice and revenge, *two things* that quickly transport any disaffected Creature, beyond the bounds of *Truth*, *Reason*, and *Humanity* is self? Will any indifferent person, concur with those, who thinks the Kings business

ness *ill done*, only because they can no longer *solicit* it? Can an unbias'd man, believe the justice of his Courts corrupted, and his Judges *Arbitrary*, because it is the opinion of some perhaps, that have a mind to *sit* on the *Bench*? Are those fair and competent Asserters of an *Arbitrary Power*, and good Witnesses of their Princes Tyranny, only because they are banish'd the *Court*, and could see nothing of it, when they sat in the *Council*? Lastly, can he truly fear *Papery*, that is of no *Religion* at all, and be an *impartial* Judge of the Temper of the Duke of *York*, that is his avow'd and mortal Enemy; neither the Civil Law, or Common, will admit of any *prejudic'd* Evidence? And for God's sake, let the King and Government, when they are *arraign'd*, have as fair play for it, as one of your *Joyners*, or *Cobblers*, a *Colledge*, or an *Hewson*, would expect.

Next, my Lord, you would prove the *Queens Association* to have been carried on, without her knowledge, from a certain Speech of hers, to her *Parliament*; but whether the Quotation be false, or true, we won't dispute at present; but this seems to me, a plain sort of owning the Paper, of which your Friends are accused, only you would say somewhat for your selves, in not acquainting his Majesty with it a little sooner. by telling the Kingdom, his Predecessor, Queen *Elizabeth*, knew nothing of such a Combination, any more than himself, and that she look'd upon it, as an *obligation* from her Subjects, to find so many *hands* unknowingly *subscrib'd*; but granting, they agree in this circumstance, that such a *Loyal Design*, as well as a *Treasonable* one, may, possibly have been carried on in the *dark*. Can you imagine, my Lord, She would have taken it for an *Obligation* too, had they tender'd her a Paper, that would have sworn her out of her *Supremacy*, and lodg'd it in the *major part* of her House of Commons? and with what face, could ever any Subject, offer a scheme of Rebellion to his Sovereign, and desire of him, the liberty to commence a *Rebel*, and a *Traytor*, only for his *defence* and *preservation*?

The Story of the Queen of *Scots*, which you would make so plain a Parallel, is in my judgment, as little to the purpose. First, Did the Queen of *England* shew her self as vigorous in opposing the disinheriting of her next Heir as our King has been both kind and just, in asserting the Rights of his Brother and Successor? Secondly, Do you think, if she had really declared her self against the proceedings of her Parliament in that Affair, her Subjects would have enter'd into an *Association* to have done it by themselves? No, no, your Lordship is too good an Historian, not to know that things were then carried on with her Majesties Connivance, and tacit Approbation, and that she acted her part of the Tragedy, like one of *Machiavel's Monarchs behind the Curtain*; and for which, even Writers, very favourable to your *own Party*, and no *Causines*, have justly condemn'd her.

And it seems, all your *own* factious Crew don't agree with your Lordship, in thinking the Proceedings against that unfortunate, Queen so fair and honourable; for very lately, a certain Protestant Buffoon, has prov'd it, *plain Murder*, in his second part of a thing call'd a *Speculum*, or the View and Reflection of a Chimera, *half Droll, half Author, and half Als*; and from that very Case, this Hotch-potch Animal, proves King-killing to be the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; but I hope, you will agree with me, (because he differs from you in this point) that this his Argumentation, is like the rest of his Stuff, very ridiculous; but as for his abusing the *Church-men*, there you may shake hands again, for he paints them out very pleasantly, like Fools, Anticks, and Jack-Puddings, and you draw them out terribly, all in blood, *Governours of the Popish Interest*, revengeful, implacable, and such as *never forgive*; so that between you, the Clergy may be pretty well secur'd of an Odium, when you can expose them even in the two several extreams. But would a Jew take such to be Christians, that vilify the Church, of which they would seem to be, and ridicule the very Religion, they are thought to profess.

And here I can't but observe, a *Barbarous*, as well as a Malicious hint of your Lordships; who, when you have represented, how violent the *Parliament* was against the Succession of the Queen of *Scots*, with a cruel and emphatical Malice, cry out — *Nay, and against her Life too*. We know, my Lord, the *Parliament* help'd the *Grand-Mother* to the Block, and you saw another made the *Father stoop to it*. But would you have your Associated *Baalites* sacrifice the Blood of the *Son* too? This is stretching up a *private* Revenge,

Revenge, to vye even with the Vengeance of the Almighty, and an angry God only visits to the *third* and *fourth* Generation. Your Lordship in this Inlination shews a great deal of Inhumanity, not to be parallel'd but by that of your *Friends*, the *Dissenters*, in their Association, or the *Cannibals* of the *West-Indies*, which, as some say, infest our Plantations there, and refresh themselves in nothing more than in the Blood of an Enemy. These are the bloody Measures which your Passion transports you to, and not your Judgment directs: People look through these transparent Politicks like Water, and see nothing but Malice and Revenge at the bottom.

Your last politick Observation is, *That his present Majesty is the first Prince that ever was perswaded to be so willing, to settle indubitably the Title of his presumptive Heir.* But why perswaded? Has he not natural Affection enough to be willing himself? And would he not much rather be thought the first (should he humour your Faction) that ever unnaturally disinherited a kind Brother, and his Heir apparent? And, I believe, nothing grieves you more, than that his Majesty's Consent must be requir'd; and could a Parliament be gotten once to act again without him, no doubt but the Bill of Exclusion would be the first Act of the Session. But the Law of Nations ever since the Time of *Justinian*, the Laws of the Kingdom down from the Conqueror, have happily placed the Sanction of every Law in the Will of the Prince, and you and your Friends must be contented, my Lord, till you can perswade the King to give you his *Le Roy Vult*, and the Crown and Scepter to the Bargain.

And seeing you are pleas'd to call the D. of Y. but a *presumptive Heir*, and seem to lay such a stress and Emphasis upon the new-coin'd word, we will discuss this Business a little further. My Lord, (if I mistake not) your Friend you pretend to vindicate, was the first that applied this pretty Distinction to the next Heir of the Crown: It looks like a piece of State-Sophistry, and your noble Friend, some say, was fam'd for a fine distinguishing Logical Head, when a young Academick; and a body would almost swear, this *Vindicator*, the *Vindicated*, and the noble Peer, differ only like the little Man with three great Names, who still makes but the same person: And it was a merry Conceit of a pleasant Gentleman, who never had a good opinion of these sort of *individual Triumvirs*. But though there may not be much weight in such a quaint Fancy, I am sure there are some that disturb the Government with the quaintness of their Politicks, as if they had so many Heads too as well as Names, and verifed the feign'd Monster of the Poets in themselves, in resembling a sort of factious *Hydra*, and which kind of Creature, (if you believe *St. John's Revelations* in the Isle of *Patmos*) this *Whore of Babylon*, (with which terrible Tropology your canting Priests are always alarming the People) is seen to ride on. And I hope you may allow this as good an Interpretation of the Vision, or at least it may pass for a Moral drawn from it; That when-ever Popery is brought into England, it will be on the Back of some of the greatest Politicians, among your Friends (as you call them) the *Dissenters*, and by the sole Projects of some of their dangerous Head-pieces: And if Commentators can expound the *Cruelties* of the Church of Rome, Emblematyally represented in this *purpl'd Harlot*, I don't see but it may be as warrantable an Exposition to make the bloody Principles of your rebellious Assemblies, predicted in the Description of the *Scarlet Beast*: Your fine Notion of his being a *presumptive Heir*, looks more like a Distinction in Metaphysics, than a Term in Law: In this your selves seem rather spinning your Politicks into Cobwebs, as if you only design'd to catch Flies; for a bare *presumptive Heir* is really none at all, and that you can quickly prove, I warrant you, when it serves for your Turns; much less can one be call'd so, that appears to be the immediate Successor, and has none living to intercept the Title. Your Lordship need not mince the Matter so tenderly, and only distinguish him out of his Title: You have a Law-Maxim, I warrant you, at your Fingers end, that will prove him *no Heir at all*, with a *Non-datur Heres viventis*. But this receiv'd Aphorism among the Learned, in the Faculty (though it happen to be true Latin) yet is a fallacious and *ignoramus* sort of Sophistry, when every body knows the common Acception of the word *Heir*, and that it is oftner applied to him that expects to be so, *in futuro*, than to one that is actually, and *de facto*, such. With this your distinction of *Presumptive*, you may make an Heir of him that is never so far off, if you can but have a strong *Presumption* he will survive all those that are before him; or even of one that has no Right at all, if you presume he shall destroy all those that have, or get them to relinquish their Titles,

Titles, and so make himself a Proprietor, as the *Civilians* phrase it, *Pro derelicto*. Upon these Considerations, you may call the fair Idol you now set up and worship, a *presumptive* Heir too: And if you call him only *Presumptive*, who may be dispossest by the Birth of another, neither in that Notion will it hold good too. We have many Places here in *England*, my Lord, where Custom has made it statutable for the youngest Brother to inherit; but I can see no Reason; why this youngest one may not pass for an *Heir apparent* for the while, till there is a younger again *appears* to dispossest him. Though in most of these Cases, there may be more ground for a Presumption of their being debarr'd the Succession, by a latter Birth, *viz.* from the Fertility of the Parent, than your Lordship himself will admit in the Case of the D. of Y. who but in the same Paragraph talk of the *King's being married to a Lady of great Birth, whom, with the help of the Spanish Ambassador, you could have prov'd long ago, was never able to have Children.* And then who is not the D. of Y. an *apparent Heir* to the Crown, as much as ever your Friend was to his Estate of 9000 *l. per annum*? Or who may be presum'd to pretend to it now, beside his Highness?

But I can tell you other Mediums you seem to take, to prove his Royal Highness; but to *presume* himself a Successor.

First, Because 'tis possible that according to the words of your *Association*, he may be *subdued, expell'd and destroy'd*, and so has no absolute certainty of succeeding to the *Crown*, because not so much as Security for his *Life*: But this is making him but a *presumptive* Heir, upon a *presumption* of your own Power to dispossest him, or the readines of your *Associators* to subscribe for his Murder and Destruction. These are Methods the *Turks* and *Jesuits* use, to make Princes resign their Birth-rights with their Breath, and keep them from being any ways *apparent*, by sending them to the Grave.

Secondly, Because you have cajol'd another young Prince (unfortunate in your very Favours) to set up for a Pretender, notwithstanding the sad Presidents you have of the miscarriage of no less than two such Projects in the time of *Henry the Seventh*: And this deluded and abus'd young Gentleman, I am afraid, will only stand oblig'd to you, for having made him the *greatest* Cully, but the *poorest* Prince. I confess, I have read, my Lord, that in the Parliament, 20 of *Henry the Third*, it was mov'd in the House, that such *natural* Sons as were born *before* Wedlock, might have the same Right of Succession, as those that were truly *legitimate* and begot *after*: But the Motion was soon unanimously rejected, all declaring, they *would never change their old Laws of England*; and your Lordship and his Adherents will hardly find there was ever such an Act pass'd since. I grant, if you consult the Constitutions of the Imperial Law, and the Codes of *Justinian*, instead of the Statutes of the Realm; you will find an *illegitimate* Birth allow'd to put in for an Heir too: But I may desire all those busie, factious Archiv-searchers, and Record-mongers, you now imploy, to discover it in any Roll or Act of Parliament. And 'tis strange you should set up now, my Lord, for such an Alteration in a Prince's Right to the *Crown*, against the Sense and Opinion of the very Parliaments you adore, and who opposed it, ever in the Succession of every *private* Subject to his Estate. By these Methods you may prove a Prince of *Wales*, never an *apparent Heir*, because it is in the Power of an *associated* Crew of Male-contents, to set up another Pretender.

Lastly, You may think the D. of Y. but a *presumptive Heir*, because you think a Parliament may dash his Expectation with a *Bill of Exclusion*. But pray, my Lord, would the Judgment of that *High Court*, and *Sanhedrim*, ever make him really *appear* to have the less Right, *In foro Conscientie*? The very sacred Writ tell us, that all things are not just and equal that are *expedient*: And there is no necessity we should cease to be Christians, to set up for *States-men*, or burn our Bibles, though it were to prevent our own Suffering in the Flame; and one of the greatest Reasons your Sticklers urge for such a dangerous Alteration in the Government, is but Matter of *Expediency*. These factious Innovators, I confess, sling about a common Objection too, *That it is a little strange*, a Parliament, their *publick* Representative, should not be allow'd, what we grant every *private* Subject, *viz.* To *Disinherit*. But, I hope, there is some difference between an Heir to three Kingdoms, and one perhaps only to so many Acres; Lands and Leases may be dispos'd of by the Proprietor, when Crowns and Scepters are out of the disposal of the Prince. The Laws of Nations will allow men a Dominion over their Issues and

Estates, when they won't Kings a Power of disinheriting their own Successors, much less an hereditary Monarch to pass for a Parliament's Heir, instead of the Crown's. Our Chronicles tell us of one of our young Princes, that laid hold on the Crown as soon as ever the old King was but suppos'd dead, and told the dying Monarch, when he reviv'd for a little while, that he thought him expir'd, and then knew the Crown to be presently his. And why would not the D. of Y. (who notwithstanding all your Lordships malicious Suggestions, never shew'd such a forwardness to mount the Throne) have the *same* Diadem immediately transferr'd, should his Majesty, which (I hope will be long first) yield to the same Fate, the Laws admitting no more of an *Interregnum*, than an *Exclusion*? But if your Lordship (whose Politicks are best understood from the Measures you take) can bring this Monarchy to an Elective one, then, I grant, the *Successor* must be forc'd to court your *honourable Assemblies* for their Suffrages: But then I dare promise, he will wave his Pretension to the Crown, and have more reason to despair of Justice, than those that lately *let fall* their Suits and Actions: Then he shall relinquish his Right to the Government of *Old England*, and leave your Lordship sole Candidate, to be King of a *New Poland*.

There are many Creatures sometimes *maliciously good*, and that makes your Lordship bestow a few faint Elogies on his Majesty, only that his Brother may appear the more odious; and with a great deal of *spight* you could picture him a Saint, could you make the other the more truly to represent the Devil; the *Greatness* of our Sovereign's Spirit is as well known as the *Meekness* of his Temper, and his *Abilities* and *Courage*, need no such *spightful* Pen as yours, to write the Panegyrick. But why then must his Highness, that has the same Blood in his Veins, be thought an effeminate Person, and a Coward? but the best of it is, no one will think him so the sooner, for an envious Suggestion of his inveterate Enemy; and no indifferent person can be so mad, as to take the Character of the Duke of York, from a Friend of the E. of S. And can those with *Modersty* accuse him for want of Valour, that has hazarded his Life for the Service of his King and Country, against the Forces of the *Dutch*, and the Rage of Wind and Water, who have never shown any of their own, unless it were in Arms against their Sovereign, and fighting under the Banner of a Common-wealth? And as for his Temper, it is both generous and mild enough, and not hated by such *Multitudes*, as your Lordship would insinuate, and by *none*, I fancy, but those that fear it, and have *mirrid* the severest of its Animadversions; and it was the Foxes Trick in the Fable, my Lord, when it had offended the Guardian Mastiff of the Flock, to *accuse* him for the *murdering* of the Sheep.

And as *Religion* as you seem to be in the Close, you shall find us altogether as *Devout*, praying with more Zeal, and less Hypocrisy, that the God of Heaven, who is the searcher of all Hearts, would still detect the deep Designs of *yours*, bless the King, in defeating the *Counsels* of all *Achitophels*, and the *Curses* of every *Shimei*.

F I N I S.

